

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. No claims have been amended or added. Claim 1 has been canceled. Thus, claims 2-42 are pending, of which claims 24-42 have been withdrawn.

DRAWINGS

The Office Action objected to the drawings. Formal drawings are submitted herewith. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 2 was objected to as being a substantial duplicate of claim 1. Claim 1 has been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to claim 2 be withdrawn.

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

In response to the request for information, submitted herewith are documents containing information related to products of Chrome Systems.

CLAIM REJECTION – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 13 was rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Specifically, claim 13 the phrase “higher-level

application” was identified as not clear. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13 is clear in light of Figure 2 and page 9 of the specification as originally filed.

Specifically, the specification states:

According to one implementation, collaboration agent 204 is selectively invoked by a higher-level application executing on, for example, server 202. In this regard, collaboration agent 204 must communicatively interact with external logic (e.g., such an application). The control of this and other functions of collaboration agent 204 is performed by control logic 302. More particularly, control logic 302 selectively invokes an instance of one or more of the features of collaboration engine 304 in response to commands received from such higher-level applications, and/or from commands directly received from a user and/or a provider. As used herein, control logic 302 is intended to represent any of a wide variety of control logic known in the art such as, but not limited to, processor(s), controller(s), application specific integrated circuit(s) (ASIC), programmable logic device(s) (PLD), and the like. In accordance with one embodiment, control logic 302 is intended to represent a series of executable instructions which, when executed by a host processor, implement the control functions described herein.

See page 9, lines 7-19. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 21-23 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,794,207 issued to Jay S. Walker (*Walker*). Claim 1 has been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 2-4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 21-23 are not anticipated by *Walker*.

Claim 2 recites:

a collaboration agent, to provide an interface through which digitally disparate sellers, dealers and/or manufacturers agree to selectively participate in commercial transactions for requesting users, and

to enable each of the sellers, dealers and/or manufacturers to define terms and conditions under which they selectively participate with one another to facilitate commercial collaboration between these otherwise digitally disparate providers to provide, at least in part, ***product inventory information*** from participating sellers, dealers and/or manufacturers including provider-specific product attributes.

Thus, Applicants claim providing an agent that can facilitate commercial collaboration between digitally disparate sellers, dealers and/or manufacturers, including product inventory information with provider-specific product attributes.

Walker discloses a system in which a buyer may shop for ***offers*** available from sellers. See col. 8, lines 28-41. However, *Walker* does not disclose an agent that can facilitate commercial collaboration between digitally disparate sellers, dealers and/or manufacturers, including product inventory information with provider-specific product attributes. Therefore, *Walker* cannot anticipate the invention as claimed in claim 2.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 21-23 depend from claim 2. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 21-23 are not anticipated by *Walker* for at least the reasons set forth above.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 15-20 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Walker*. Each of claims 5, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 15-20 depends, directly or indirectly, from claim 2. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 5, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 15-20 are not rendered obvious by *Walker*.

The Office Action cites various U.S. Patent documents to support assertions regarding the obviousness of the claim limitations. In general, no specific citations

and/or motivations are provided. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the obviousness rejections are incomplete.

Even if the obviousness rejections set forth in the Office Action can be considered complete, the cited references do not cure the deficiencies of *Walker* set forth above. Therefore, *Walker*, with or without the additional references, cannot render the invention as claimed in claims 5, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 15-20 obvious.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date:

Nov 25, 2005



Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778

Attachments

Application No. 09/898,896
Amendment dated November 25, 2005
Response to Office Action of May 25, 2005

Atty. Docket No. 4606P004
Examiner Abdi, Kambiz
TC/A.U. 3621

Appendix